



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,527	04/04/2001	Martin Langhammer	174/205	2831

36981 7590 03/18/2005

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS FL C3  
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER

MAI, TAN V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/826,527

Applicant(s)

LANGHAMMER, MARTIN

Examiner

Tan V Mai

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2004, 12/22/04, *Man' 3/2005*
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7-10, 18-21 and 28-30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 11-17, 22-27 and 31-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-3 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Fandrianto et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 4).

3. Claims 1-3, 11-12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Thi et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 6).

4. Claims 22-27 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fandrianto et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 8).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fandrianto et al. in view of Lim et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 9).

6. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fandrianto et al. in view of Lim et al as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Nguyen et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 10).

7. Claims 22-27 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thi et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 14).

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thi et al. in view of Lim et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 15).

9. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thi et al. in view of Lim et al as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Nguyen et al.

Rejection grounds continue to be those set forth in the previous office action (Paper No. 7, paragraph 16).

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 10-20-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant, in his remarks, argues a major point that:

"The Examiner contends that each of Fandrianto, Duncan and Thi discloses all the features of applicant's independent claims 1 and 11. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Although Fandrianto, Duncan and Thi arguably disclose computation units and word conditioning logic, these components are disposed along a single datapath where the word conditioning functionality is incorporated into the computation unit....

Unlike applicant's claimed invention, none of the references that are relied on by the Examiner *show or suggest providing a separate datapath from the output of the computation unit to a storage destination, where signals on the datapath are propagated through word conditioning logic, in addition to a critical path through which signals are propagated from the input of the computation unit to its output without propagating through the word conditioning logic*, as specified in claims 1 and 11." (emphasis added).

With respect to the arguments, the examiner carefully reviews all the applied references and claims 1 & 11.

First, the examiner believes claims 1 & 11 broadly recite a serial connection of "computation unit" (e.g, element 101 of Fig. 1a), "word conditioning logic" (element 150) and "storage destination" (element 100). Second, (1) Frandrianto et al, e.g., see Fig. 13, disclose a MPY (604) and (elements 626, 628) which are considered the claimed "computation unit" and "word conditioning logic", respectively. It is noted that Frandrianto et al do NOT show the claimed "storage destination"; however, the result of element (628) should be stored in memory means; and (2) Thi, e.g., see Fig. 34, discloses "computation unit" (4030-4046), "word condition logic" (4048, 4052 & 4050)

and "storage destination" (4026). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made the claims 1 & 11 read on either Fandrianto et al or Thi. Therefore, the rejections are still proper.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tan V. Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3726. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Wed and Fri. from 9:30am to 2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is:

Application/Control Number: 09/826,527  
Art Unit: 2124

Page 6

Official (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Tan V. Mai  
Primary Examiner